

Bureau of Integrated Programs

ESSA Advisory Team

Comprehensive School Support and Improvement

Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Support and Improvement for Schools

Each State must describe its system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans regarding support and improvement for schools. The description of a State's system of performance management must include information on the State's review and approval of LEA plans, collection and use of data, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance. If a table is provided below, the State's description must include strategies and timelines.

System of Performance Management Describe the State's system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans for Support and Improvement for Title I schools.

What We Currently Do:

-Grant Management System is utilized by Schools/Districts to create their Title I Plans. These plans include activities schools plan to incorporate based on Student Performance Data and Problems of Practice. The plans go through revisions as necessary and with the guidance of a Title I Regional Consultant.

Guiding Question:

How can the State ensure that Title I schools and districts are continuously receiving the supports they need, and how does the State ensure these schools are improving?

Next Steps:

Joey Nichol's Group:

State Supports;

- Swift
- The blending of SWIFT and Schoolwide requirements
 - Schoolwide Process – the State consultants, the plan template and the rubric
 - POP, Needs Assessment, Innovation Plans Support through the Summer Summit and Quarterly Meetings and the Tri-annual Review

Clarifying questions: Group wanted to know “How is improving defined?”

Can we consolidate the repeated comments on the ESSA website?

SUPPORTS

- Create a survey to ask schools what is helpful and what is not helpful?
- Group felt that many of the schools are using data to help them. Data helps to point to reasons where and why the districts need more help.

- Schools feel that they know who to contact at the NHDOE for the appropriate guidance for the proper use of money.
- NH Educators Network helps this process.
- Is there a way to get access to outside the NHDOE supports from the website and/or NH Educators Network?

Title I Managers are a help. They suggest other resources during Regional meetings, phone calls, and onsite visits.

- Question: How does the NHDOE want school to assess student performance? Folks use SLO's, Shared attributes, SMART goals. Shared attributes were considered by some to be the most effective way to assess student performance.
- Questions: Are school connecting with mental health groups??
- Talking with other schools to gain ideas of what is available for supports.
- Leadership committees oversee the various school committees to be sure of the common vision with the school

Richard Feistman's Group:

- Need more of a template for what the outcomes could or should be looked at...better than creating own needs assessment.
- Need clarification on performance measures – is there a rubric or choice – could there be?
- Need common language – do not know what we mean by Title I plan vs Instructional rounds..vs Problems of practice
- GMS limits the number of characters....can attach and like the attachment system.
- Reallocation application in survey monkey was hard- especially for districts who have lots of schools.
 - Not tech savy enough to use multiple software (e.g., survey monkey, Indistar, good docs, good forms) better if they interfaced....google docs and others makes things difficult. Cut and paste is important.
- Templates in general – written advice from NHDOE needed
- Object and function codes are problematic – business management manual needs more detailthere is a disconnect between business management use of GMS and programmatic (not all agree on this)
- Grant writers/Regions do different things – can be a good thing.
- “Do what works”, but a rubric would help.
- Onsite – digital folders can be tricky...some good....still need a shared interface.
- Title I management on district level – so some not sure what to say
- Several like the system as is.
- Desire Expediency – being able to open grant can be tricky.
- Moving Title I to more than 1 year would be good.
- Regional model of support is working well. Department's responsibility not to overload consults who are responsible to maintain responsiveness to districts.

- Really helpful to have knowledgeable staff.
- Is the response and connectivity the same across regions?
- Localized meeting with districts is really valuable and important.

Jane Waterhouse's Group:

State Supports Identified:

- SWIFT
- The blending of SWIFT and Schoolwide requirements
 - Schoolwide Process – the State consultants, the plan template and the rubric
- POP, Needs Assessment, Innovation Plans Support through the Summer Summit and Quarterly Meetings and the Tri-annual Review
- Family Engagement Support
- Title I Consultants, support and regional meetings
- DOE website
- Network
- Open NH courses

Comments:

- Make the goal at the Federal level to be more like the SWIFT Process
- More focus on meeting the needs of all students
- State supports need to be linked to the specific needs of schools
- What are the DOE's expectations for increasing test scores?
- DOE needs to assist schools with measures and tool to identify root causes
- Also need to provide support with root cause analysis and recommendations for improvement

Mary Bubnis and Peter Durso's Group:

"Improving Defined"

- Not sure yet
- Accountability committee working on
- Could be student data; family and community engagement data
- Assurance that students are growing

Q.1 Title I Plans specifically/Grants Management system

- Criteria for exiting?
- Can Focus and Priority school plans align in order to write one plan?
- We have a lot in place: triangular review is good: not having to go into Indistar to do it
- Peer review and feedback is good
- Percentage of outcomes: behavior 4, attendance3

- Problems of Practice Model helped a lot to keep your eye on the ball
- There is a whole component in Indistar to show progress
- Indistar-Don't need it
- Funding Librarians
- NH Network is used often
- How do you stop becoming a Priority school consistent measures appreciated
- Need one plan
- Annual review process has improved
- Appreciate the peer review process
- Can include family and community engagement and is helpful if not just academics
- Culture is a major component
- POP is helpful

What would be helpful:

- Webinar on school plans
- Separate opportunities for Title I districts to come together

Review and Approval of LEA Plans. Describe the State's process for supporting the development, review, and approval of activities in LEA Title I Plans, including a description of how the State will determine if LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State's strategies for implementation of Support and Improvement of Schools.

What We Currently Do:

-Schools/Districts complete yearly assurances indicating that their Title I Plan is either the same as the previous year or that revisions have been made. If revisions have been made, they are justified using Student Performance Data or Problems of Practice (based on the school's needs assessment). Title I Regional Consultants review plans, hold regional meetings with Title I program managers, and provide technical assistance as requested or necessary.

Guiding Question: How can the State support Title I schools as they create plans to address gaps in student achievement? What process will ensure schools/districts are focused on the most important areas related to student learning? How should the State engage Title I schools to create plans and what should the process be to review and approve those plans?

Next Steps:

Joey Nichol's Group:

Clarifying question: Is there a bar or level that the state requires?

- NH has a high graduation rate. It is above the 60% mark.
- Whatever type of data is available to help determine the gaps should be performance data...measurable data.
- Each individual student needs to be taken into consideration.
- Not just one advisory for Special Ed. We want to have more competency based programs to help promote the theory of "all means all."

Special Education students may access Title I services

Richard Feistman's Group:

- Schoolwide plan Rubric (new) was really useful.
- Clear guidance on how to specifically address gaps and plans is needed
- Schools would like more on school needs assessment.
- Need continued support on how to use data to address gaps.
- Hard for priority schools to understand the different plans (Schoolwide, SIG, District, etc).
- Different plans can be difficult to manage.
- Large districts have several managers over different plans. – plans are overwhelming.
- It would be nice to be able to streamline plans –
- Competitive grant confusion.

- Seminars – Want more workshops on blending and braiding (need more PD on operating grant). Need DOE specific guidance (in writing).
- Clearer guidance on how Title I and SPED overlap...want it written.
- Guidance on braiding models....models.
- Move to digital was good.
- Expertise lies in the school – Targeted groups should be determined by schools.
 - Still want guidance on finding the best focus.
 - Caution about strategies that are exclusively evidence based.

Jane Waterhouse's Group:

- The process we have in place works. Our consultant at the DOE is always available to provide TA , guidance and support in all areas, in real time.
- Create opportunities for schools to see what other successful programs are doing so that we can learn from their best practices
- Regional Networks of Instructional Rounds - utilize technology for online meetings
- Need for more dedicated attention to providing support from Title I project manager – always busy with more important things. Grant turnaround time can sometimes be months.
- State should support school project management if they are interested in having PMs who are able to fulfill all requirements of TI programs.
- Sometimes the district has to pay salaries for TI as the students' needs far outweigh the allocations

What processes will ensure schools/districts are focused on the most important areas related to student learning?

- Communication needs to happen both within and outside district. Only a few people involved in this, so messages from DOE are not getting through to those who would benefit.

How should the State engage Title I schools to create plans what should the process be to review and approve the plans?

- No school committees are presently doing these reviews, as staff is so overwhelmed with meeting the needs of the students, covering all the requirements of their positions, and working on all the newest and latest initiatives.
- We understand that this is an area that we need to prioritize for ESEA compliance. It's good to know that the State is working on a plan to simplify this process.

More DOE training, such as the summer TI and TII training at the DOE

Mary Bubnis and Peter Durso's Group:

Q2: Approval of Activities? LEA activities align with specific strategies?

- School districts complete yearly assurances based on needs assessment
- Having webinar talking about what a plan is and why do we need it
- Richard F. came to Concord to assist me (very helpful)
- Title I schools come together to do their Title I plans together (especially for new people)
- Gaps in student Achievement-give us more money
- State Access to Library (Like MA)
- Can we have examples of evidence –based practices throughout the State of New Hampshire Conference of Best Practices
- Types of practice listed under schools, so schools can connect one another for networking and find out more.
- Time for schoolwide schools to get together to discuss plans
- Discuss case studies of successful schools